

**Advisory and Work Group Benchmark Activities to Arrive at
The Proposed Space Allocations**

- **Visioning Meeting** – On January 30, 2004, a Visioning Meeting was held with the Work Group and representatives of most courthouse tenants. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce tenants to the project, obtain information from them as to whether or not their offices were potential candidates for initial phase relocation to the BOA, and to identify potential barriers to their moving.
- **Data Collection** – Each relocation candidate was requested to complete and return a fact sheet to BFA, which provided some base line information about their offices (such as the number of staff and general classification of work each staff member performed). BFA then held one-on-one meetings with those offices to arrive at: (1) preliminary identification of relocation candidates; and (2) office space standards that would reasonably meet the offices' needs.
- **Initial Advisory Group Meeting** - The kick-off meeting with the Advisory Group was held on April 29, 2004, during which BFA identified the entities that were not court-related and which were perhaps the most desirable candidates for the initial moves. These included the Tax Collector, Property Appraiser, certain Clerk functions (Official Records, Finance and Human Resources (HR)), Supervisor of Elections, County Attorney, and certain Board functions (MIS, other than the data center, County Attorney, Management Services Administration and HR). The Florida Legislature added the requirement that the county continue to provide space for Guardian Ad Litem (GAL), therefore they were added to the list of potential relocations. These entities' total current square footages exceeded the current availability of space at the BOA.

As BFA needed criteria to prioritize offices for relocation to the BOA, as well as space standards to project the amount of space required, the Advisory Group considered and approved the following (Attachment #4):

- space planning standards for office/workstation sizes;
 - office space planning standards, which proposed sharing special use spaces on a single floor when possible (such as shared break rooms, meeting/conference rooms, restrooms, so forth), with net usable area of 175-200 net square feet per full-time employee (FTE) as the target; and
 - relocation criteria and principles to guide the recommendation as to which entities would be proposed for relocation from the courthouse to the BOA and where they would be relocated to within the BOA.
- **May 10-11, 2004 Design Charrette**: Upon receiving the Advisory Group's guidelines, BFA organized a design charrette to individually verify programmatic requirements and space

- needs including: space needs based on organizational structure; historic and projected growth; public access, adjacency and co-location requirements; and special issues and needs.. BFA's findings and recommendations were presented in an open house meeting, with the unrealized expectation that this would result in a recommendation for Phase One relocation and occupancy at the BOA that was supported by all entities. BFA's recommendation was that the following entities would be relocated from the Courthouse to the BOA:
 - P-3 Level - Property Appraiser's Data Center;
 - 1st Floor - Tax Collector, Property Appraiser, certain Clerk functions (such as official records and public viewing); and
 - 2nd Floor – GAL and certain Clerk functions (such as Finance, HR, Payroll and Internal Auditor).

The overall weakness of the proposal was that it focused on what entities would be the "best fit" for initial relocations to the BOA, without giving weight to what courthouse space would best meet the needs of those entities that will be remaining in the courthouse. The Courts and the Clerk expressed concerns that this recommendation did not allow them to centralize their functions (including the Clerk's desire to centralize his court-related functions on the first floor of the courthouse in order to increase efficiencies, and the Courts' desire to centralize Circuit functions on the 3rd floor and County functions on the 2nd floor) (Attachment #5). Approximately 58% of the space proposed for relocation from the courthouse was on the 1st floor – which the Courts did not consider desirable courtroom space. Further, the proposal did not address the relocation of Traffic Court functions, and entities broadly expressed the concern that timeframes were not provided.

- May 24, 2004 Work Group Meeting – BFA presented a second series of options. While the entities identified in the May 11, 2004 proposal for relocation to the BOA remained the same, it addressed some of the concerns previously raised:
 - The Clerk's court-related functions were consolidated on the 1st floor of the courthouse with only limited space renovations (Clerk Felony and Clerk Probate and Appeals would be relocated from the 2nd and 3rd floors to the first); and
 - Timelines and sequencing were presented.

However concerns remained:

- The Clerk did not believe the amount of space being identified on the first floor of the BOA Annex for his relocated functions was adequate to house Official Records, Archives, Public Viewing, Imaging, HR, and internal auditors, he did not want to relocate only portions of their operations.
- The existing layout of the Property Appraiser's and Tax Collector's space on the 1st floor of the courthouse did not meet the Clerk's needs and more extensive renovations were sought (Attachments #5 and #6).

- The Courts needed courtrooms and space to meet their immediate need to accommodate additional staff anticipated for the upcoming year. A master plan for courtroom build-out in the long-term was requested.
 - A courtroom, with requisite support facilities, was not identified for activities currently performed in the Traffic Court building.
- Individual Meetings with the Courts: BFA met with Court Administration staff and developed a master plan for the courthouse, which reflects where courtrooms and other court functions could be located in the long-term, considering the architectural realities of the courthouse. The master plan does not detail precise programming – for example, area identified as “Mediation” may be programmed for a hearing room in the future. The master plan also located a courtroom and other related space on the 4th floor of the courthouse for Traffic Court.
- September 10, 2004 Advisory Group Meeting: The proposed master plan and Phase One allocations/relocations were presented to the Advisory Group.
 - The Supervisor of Elections was added to the list previously presented on May 11, providing necessary hearing room and office space needs for the Courts, as well as space needed to add a full courtroom (complimented with existing Court Administration space) on the 3rd floor.
 - The Supervisor of Elections felt his long-term and current-term needs were not going to be met in the amount of space being allocated at BOA, and it did not allow him to centralize his operations to improve efficiencies.
 - A 4th floor courtroom was the proposed location for Traffic Court. Neither the Public Defender nor the State Attorney supported this location for Traffic Court. They expressed concerns with the number of visitors this would bring to the 4th floor (where their offices are located) and the reality that this would eliminate their opportunity to grow into this space.
- September 17, 2004 Advisory Group Meeting: Proposals to address the concerns expressed at the September 10, 2004 meeting were presented and the Advisory Group unanimously approved the space allocation. However, additional growth space for the Public Defender and the State Attorney, beyond what was presented, remained to be identified.